

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

This amendment adds and changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claim 6 has been amended to improve its readability without narrowing its scope. New claim 12 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-12 are now pending in this application.

Title

The Office Action stated that the title was not descriptive. Applicant has amended the title to be more descriptive, namely to be "A SCANNER UNIT AND CARRIAGE THEREFOR".

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,920,408 to Nagano (hereafter "Nagano"). Claims 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,923,854 to Banios (hereafter "Banios"). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano in view of Banios, and further in view of JP 362113595 A to Yamazaki et al. (hereafter "Yamazaki"). Claims 4, 8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,765,424 to Daley (hereafter "Daley"). Claims 7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano in view of Yamazaki. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano in view Banios, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,653,714 to Dietz et al. (hereafter "Dietz"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a carriage and comprises an electrically conductive frame, and a lighting circuit, attached to one end portion of the frame near a positive electrode of a cold

cathode fluorescent lamp of the carriage, for lighting the cold cathode fluorescent lamp. Nagano fails to disclose or suggest either of these features of claim 1, or their attendant advantages.

Nagano discloses a color image reader including a glass 12 disposed on the surface of a cabinet 13 and on which a manuscript 11 is placed (Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 25-27). The reader has a light source 17 controlled by a lighting circuit 15 (col. 3, lines 33-34).

Nagano, however, fails to disclose or suggest that the cabinet 13 (which the Office Action equates with the frame as claimed) is electrically conductive, and thus fails to anticipate claim 1 for at least this reason.

More importantly, Nagano fails to disclose a lighting circuit, attached to one end portion of the frame near a positive electrode of a cold cathode fluorescent lamp, for lighting the cold cathode fluorescent lamp, as recited in claim 1. Specifically, Nagano fails to disclose that the position of the lighting circuit 15 (which the Office Action equates with the lighting circuit as claimed) is near a positive electrode of any of the three lighting sources 171, 172 and 173. Thus, Nagano fails to anticipate claim 1 for this further reason.

Moreover, Nagano fails to suggest the advantages of attaching the lighting circuit to the end portion of a frame near the positive electrode of a cold cathode fluorescent lamp. As disclosed in the present specification on pages 14-15, positioning the lighting circuit (inverter circuit board 64 in the embodiment disclosed) near the positive electrode (high voltage side) reduces the leak current. Nagano, failing to disclose the position of the lighting circuit as recited in claim 1, fails to suggest the advantages resulting therefrom.

Independent claim 5 also includes a lighting circuit positioned in the manner recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 5 is likewise patentable over Nagano, because, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Nagano fails to disclose this positioning of the lighting circuit.

Moreover, claim 5 also recites “a weight for stabilizing a weight balance in the first direction, said weight being attached on a side of the other end portion of the frame, which is distanced from the lighting circuit in the first direction”, a feature not disclosed by Nagano.

The Office Action apparently concedes that Nagano does not disclose this feature, but supplies Banios as allegedly disclosing a fluorescent light circuit wherein a grounded plate is placed on the frame to stabilize the weight, and cites to col. 2, lines 12-25 of Banios. The cited section of Banios, however, discloses only that voltage operation is stabilized, and says nothing about stabilizing a weight balance. Thus, even if Nagano and Banios were combined, the resultant structure would not meet the limitations of claim 5.

Claim 9 is directed to a scanner unit comprising a carriage, where the carriage includes an electrically conductive frame as recited in claim 1, the positioning of the lighting circuit as recited in claims 1 and 5, and the weight for stabilizing as recited in claim 5. Thus, the arguments for the patentability of claims 1 and 5 apply equally to claim 9.

Moreover, the scanner unit of claim 9 comprises two rails supporting the end portions of the frame, a feature not disclosed or suggested by Nagano. While the Office Action supplies Dietz as disclosing rails supporting end portions of a frame, there is no suggestion of the desirability of supporting the cabinet 13 of Nagano on rails.

The remaining references of Yamazaki and Daley were cited for allegedly disclosing various features of the claims, but fail to cure the deficiencies of Nagano, Banios and Dietz discussed above.

The dependent claims depend from one of the respective independent claims, and are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

New claim 12 has been added. New claim 12 corresponds to claim 1, but does not include the optical member of claim 1, and thus is broader. The arguments above with respect to claim 1 apply equally well to claim 12.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 6, 2004

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Registration No. 43,438

Attorneys for Applicant